arXiv:1702.01675v1 [math.CO] 6 Feb 2017

ON A BIASED EDGE ISOPERIMETRIC INEQUALITY FOR THE DISCRETE CUBE

DAVID ELLIS, NATHAN KELLER, AND NOAM LIFSHITZ

Abstract. The 'full' edge isoperimetric inequality for the discrete cube $\{0,1\}^n$ (due to Harper, Lindsey, Berstein and Hart) specifies the minimum size of the edge boundary ∂A of a set $A \subset \{0,1\}^n$, as function of $|A|$. A weaker (but more widely-used) lower bound is $|\partial A| \geq |A| \log(2^n/|A|)$, where equality holds whenever A is a subcube. In 2011, the first author obtained a sharp 'stability' version of the latter result, proving that if $|\partial A| \leq |A|(\log(2^n/|A|) + \epsilon)$, then there exists a subcube C such that $|A \Delta C|/|A| = O(\epsilon/\log(1/\epsilon))$.

The 'weak' version of the edge isoperimetric inequality has the following well-known generalization for the 'p-biased' measure μ_p on the discrete cube: if $p \leq 1/2$, or if $0 < p < 1$ and A is monotone increasing, then $p\mu_p(\partial A) \geq \mu_p(A) \log_p(\mu_p(A))$.

In this paper, we prove a sharp stability version of the latter result, which generalizes the aforementioned result of the first author. Namely, we prove that if $p\mu_p(\partial A) \leq \mu_p(A)(\log_p(\mu_p(A)) + \epsilon)$, then there exists a subcube C such that $\mu_p(A \Delta C)/\mu_p(A) = O(\epsilon'/\log(1/\epsilon'))$, where $\epsilon' := \epsilon \ln(1/p)$. This result is a central component in recent work of the authors proving sharp stability versions of a number of Erdős-Ko-Rado type theorems in extremal combinatorics, including the seminal 'complete intersection theorem' of Ahlswede and Khachatrian.

In addition, we prove a biased-measure analogue of the 'full' edge isoperimetric inequality, for monotone increasing sets, and we observe that such an analogue does not hold for arbitrary sets, hence answering a question of Kalai. We use this result to give a new proof of the 'full' edge isoperimetric inequality, one relying on the Kruskal-Katona theorem.

1. Introduction

Isoperimetric inequalities are of ancient interest in mathematics. In general, an isoperimetric inequality gives a lower bound on the 'boundary-size' of a set of a given 'size', where the exact meaning of these words varies according to the problem. In the last fifty years, there has been a great deal of interest in *discrete* isoperimetric inequalities. These deal with the 'boundary' of a set A of vertices in a graph $G = (V, E)$ – either the *edge boundary* ∂A, which consists of the set of edges of G that join a vertex in A to a vertex in $V \setminus A$, or the *vertex boundary* $b(A)$, which consists of the set of vertices of $V \setminus A$ that are adjacent to a vertex in A.

1.1. The edge isoperimetric inequality for the discrete cube, and some stability versions thereof.

A specific discrete isoperimetric problem which attracted much interest due to its numerous applications is the edge isoperimetric problem for the n-dimensional discrete cube, Q_n. This is the graph with vertex-set

Date: 3rd February 2017.

The research of N.K. was supported by the Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 402/13), the Binational US-Israel Science Foundation (grant no. 2014290), and by the Alon Fellowship.

$\{0,1\}^n$, where two 0-1 vectors are adjacent if they differ in exactly one coordinate. The edge isoperimetric problem for Q_n was solved by Harper [19], Lindsey [30], Bernstein [3], and Hart [20]. Let us describe the solution. We may identify $\{0,1\}^n$ with the power-set $\mathcal{P}([n])$ of $[n] := \{1,2,\ldots,n\}$, by identifying a 0-1 vector $(x_1,\ldots,x_n)$ with the set $\{i \in [n] : \ x_i = 1\}$. We can then view Q_n as the graph with vertex set $\mathcal{P}([n])$, where two sets $S,T \subset [n]$ are adjacent if $|S\Delta T| = 1$. The *lexicographic ordering* on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ is defined by $S > T$ iff $\min(S\Delta T) \in S$. If $m \in [2^n]$, the *initial segment of the lexicographic ordering on $\mathcal{P}([n])$ of size m* (or, in short, the *lexicographic family of size m*) is simply the m largest elements of $\mathcal{P}([n])$ with respect to the lexicographic ordering. Harper, Bernstein, Lindsey and Hart proved the following.

Theorem 1.1 (The 'full' edge isoperimetric inequality for Q_n)**.** *If $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ then $|\partial\mathcal{F}| \geq |\partial\mathcal{L}|$, where $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ is the initial segment of the lexicographic ordering of size $|\mathcal{F}|$.*

A weaker, but more convenient (and, as a result, more widely-used) lower bound, is the following:

Corollary 1.2 (The weak edge isoperimetric inequality for Q_n)**.** *If $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ then*

$$|\partial\mathcal{F}| \geq |\mathcal{F}| \log_2(2^n/|\mathcal{F}|). \tag{1.1}$$

Equality holds in (1.1) iff $\mathcal{F}$ is a subcube, so (1.1) is sharp only when $|\mathcal{F}|$ is a power of 2.

When an isoperimetric inequality is sharp, and the extremal sets are known, it is natural to ask whether the inequality is also 'stable' — i.e., if a set has boundary of size 'close' to the minimum, must that set be 'close in structure' to an extremal set?

For Corollary 1.2, this problem was studied in several works. Using a Fourier-analytic argument, Friedgut, Kalai and Naor [18] obtained a stability result for sets of size 2^{n-1}, showing that if $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ with $|\mathcal{F}| = 2^{n-1}$ satisfies $|\partial\mathcal{F}| \leq (1+\epsilon)2^{n-1}$, then $|\mathcal{F}\Delta\mathcal{C}|/2^n = O(\epsilon)$ for some codimension-1 subcube $\mathcal{C}$. (The dependence upon ϵ here is almost sharp, viz., sharp up to a factor of $\Theta(\log(1/\epsilon))$). Bollobás, Leader and Riordan (unpublished) proved an analogous result for $|\mathcal{F}| \in \{2^{n-2}, 2^{n-3}\}$, also using a Fourier-analytic argument. Samorodnitsky [33] used a result of Keevash [27] on the structure of r-uniform hypergraphs with small shadows, to prove a stability result for all $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ with $\log_2|\mathcal{F}| \in \mathbb{N}$ (i.e., all sizes for which Corollary 1.2 is tight), under the rather strong condition $|\partial\mathcal{F}| \leq (1 + O(1/n^4))|\partial\mathcal{L}|$. In [6], the first author proved the following stability result (which implies the above results), using a recursive approach and an inequality of Talagrand [34] (which was proved via Fourier analysis).

Theorem 1.3 ([6])**.** *There exists an absolute constant $c > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $0 \leq \delta < c$. If $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ with $|\mathcal{F}| = 2^d$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and $|\mathcal{F}\Delta\mathcal{C}| \geq \delta 2^d$ for all d-dimensional subcubes $\mathcal{C} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$, then*

$$|\partial\mathcal{F}| \geq |\partial\mathcal{C}| + 2^d\delta\log_2(1/\delta).$$

As observed in [6], this result is best-possible (except for the condition $0 \leq \delta < c$, which was conjectured to be unnecessary in [6]).

In [9], we obtain the following stability version of Theorem 1.1, which applies to families of arbitrary size (not just a power of 2), and which is sharp up to an absolute constant factor.

Theorem 1.4. *There exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that the following holds. If $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ and $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ is the initial segment of the lexicographic ordering of size $|\mathcal{F}|$, then there exists an automorphism σ of Q_n such that*

$$|\mathcal{F} \,\Delta\, \sigma(\mathcal{L})| \leq C(|\partial\mathcal{F}| - |\partial\mathcal{L}|).$$

The proof uses only combinatorial tools, but is much more involved than the proof of Theorem 1.3 in [6].

1.2. **Influences of Boolean functions.** An alternative viewpoint on the edge isoperimetric inequality, which we will use throughout the paper, is via *influences* of Boolean functions. For a function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$, the influence of the ith coordinate on f is defined by

$$I_i[f] := \Pr_{x \in \{0,1\}^n}[f(x) \neq f(x \oplus e_i)],$$

where $x \oplus e_i$ is obtained from x by flipping the ith coordinate, and the probability is taken with respect to the uniform measure on $\{0,1\}^n$. The *total influence* of the function is

$$I[f] := \sum_{i=1}^{n} I_i[f].$$

Over the last thirty years, many results have been obtained on the influences of Boolean functions, and have proved extremely useful in such diverse fields as theoretical computer science, social choice theory and statistical physics, as well as in combinatorics (see, e.g., the survey [25]).

It is easy to see that the total influence of a function f is none other than the size of the edge boundary of the set $A(f) = \{x \in \{0,1\}^n : \ f(x) = 1\}$, appropriately normalised: viz., $I[f] = |\partial(A(f))|/2^{n-1}$. Hence, Corollary 1.2 has the following reformulation in terms of Boolean functions and influences:

Proposition 1.5 (The weak edge isoperimetric inequality for Q_n – influence version)**.** *If $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ is a Boolean function then*

$$I[f] \geq 2\mathbb{E}[f]\log_2(1/\mathbb{E}[f]). \tag{1.2}$$

Theorem 1.3 can be restated similarly.

1.3. **The biased measure on the discrete cube.** For $p \in [0,1]$, the *p-biased measure on $\mathcal{P}([n])$* is defined by

$$\mu_p^{(n)}(S) = p^{|S|}(1-p)^{n-|S|} \quad \forall S \subset [n].$$

In other words, we choose a random subset of $[n]$ by including each $j \in [n]$ independently with probability p. When n is understood, we will omit the superscript (n), writing $\mu_p = \mu_p^{(n)}$.

The definition of influences with respect to the biased measure is, naturally,

$$I_i^p[f] := \Pr_{x \sim \mu_p}[f(x) \neq f(x \oplus e_i)],$$

and $I^p[f] := \sum_{i=1}^n I_i^p[f]$. We abuse notation slightly and write $\mu_p(f) := \mathbb{E}_{\mu_p}[f]$. We remark that we may write $I^p[f] = \mu_p(\partial A(f))$, where we define the measure μ_p

on subsets of $E(Q_n)$ by $\mu_p(\{x, x \oplus e_i\}) = p^{\sum_{j\neq i} x_i}(1-p)^{n-1-\sum_{j\neq i} x_j}$. (Note that $\mu_p(E(Q_n)) = n$, so μ_p is not a probability measure on $E(Q_n)$ unless $n = 1$.)

Many of the applications of influences (e.g., to the study of percolation [2], threshold phenomena in random graphs [4, 16], and hardness of approximation [5]) rely upon the use of the biased measure on the discrete cube. As a result, many of the central results on influences have been generalized to the biased setting (e.g. [15, 17, 21]), and the edge isoperimetric inequality is no exception. The following 'biased' generalization of Proposition 1.5 is considered folklore (see [22]).

Theorem 1.6 (The weak biased edge isoperimetric inequality for Q_n)**.** *If $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ is a Boolean function, and $0 < p \leq 1/2$, then*

$$pI^p[f] \geq \mu_p(f)\log_p(\mu_p(f)). \tag{1.3}$$

The same statement holds for all $p \in (0,1)$ if f is monotone increasing, i.e. if $(\forall i \in [n],\ x_i \leq y_i) \Rightarrow f(x) \leq f(y)$.

The proof (presented in [22]) is an easy inductive argument.

1.4. **A stability version of the biased edge isoperimetric inequality.** The first main result of this paper is the following stability version of Theorem 1.6.

Theorem 1.7. *There exist absolute constants $c_0, C_1 > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $0 < p \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and let $\epsilon \leq c_0/\ln(1/p)$. Let $f\colon \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be a Boolean function such that*

$$pI^p[f] \leq \mu_p(f)\left(\log_p(\mu_p(f)) + \epsilon\right).$$

Then there exists a subcube $S \subset \{0,1\}^n$ such that

$$\mu_p(f\Delta 1_S) \leq C_1 \frac{\epsilon'}{\ln(1/\epsilon')}\mu_p(f), \tag{1.4}$$

where $\epsilon' := \epsilon\ln(1/p)$, and $f\Delta 1_S := \{x : f(x) \neq 1_S(x)\}$.

Remark 1.8. It is straightforward to check that there exists an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that if $0 < p \leq 1/2 - C\epsilon$, then the subcube S in the conclusion of Theorem 1.7 must be monotone increasing. On the other hand, there exists an absolute constant $c > 0$ such that if $1/2 - c\epsilon \leq p \leq 1/2$, then one cannot demand that the subcube S be monotone increasing (as can be seen by taking $f = 1_{\{x_1=0\}}$).

If we assume further that f is monotone increasing, then the above theorem can be extended to $p > 1/2$.

Theorem 1.9. *For any $\eta > 0$, there exist $C_1 = C_1(\eta)$, $c_0 = c_0(\eta) > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $0 < p \leq 1-\eta$, and let $\epsilon \leq c_0/\ln(1/p)$. Let $f\colon \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be a monotone increasing Boolean function such that*

$$pI^p[f] \leq \mu_p[f]\left(\log_p(\mu_p[f]) + \epsilon\right).$$

Then there exists a monotone increasing subcube $S \subset \{0,1\}^n$ such that

$$\mu_p(f\Delta 1_S) \leq C_1 \frac{\epsilon'}{\ln(1/\epsilon')}\mu_p(f), \tag{1.5}$$

where $\epsilon' := \epsilon\ln(1/p)$.

As we show in Section 4, Theorems 1.7 and 1.9 are sharp, up to the values of the constants c_0, C_1. The proofs use induction on n, in a similar way to the proof of Theorem 1.3 in [6], but unlike in previous works, they do not use any Fourier-theoretic tools, relying only upon 'elementary' (though intricate) combinatorial and analytic arguments.

Theorems 1.7 and 1.9 are crucial tools in a recent work of the authors [8], which establishes a general method for leveraging Erdős-Ko-Rado type results in extremal combinatorics into strong stability versions, without going into the proofs of the original results. This method is used in [8] to obtain sharp (or almost-sharp) stability versions of the Erdős-Ko-Rado theorem itself [11], of the seminal 'complete intersection theorem' of Ahlswede and Khachatrian [1], of Frankl's recent result on the Erdős matching conjecture [12], of the Ellis-Filmus-Friedgut proof of the Simonovits-Sós conjecture [7], and of various Erdős-Ko-Rado type results on r-wise (cross)-t-intersecting families.

Theorem 1.9 is also used in [10] by the first and last authors to obtain sharp upper bounds on the size of the union of several intersecting families of k-element subsets of $[n]$, where $k \leq (1/2 - o(1))n$, extending results of Frankl and Füredi [14].

1.5. **A biased version of the 'full' edge isoperimetric inequality for monotone increasing families.** While the generalization of the 'weak' edge isoperimetric inequality (i.e., Corollary 1.2) to the biased measure has been known for a long time, such a generalization of the 'full' edge isoperimetric inequality (i.e., Theorem 1.1) was hitherto unknown. In his talk at the 7th European Congress of Mathematicians [24], Kalai asked whether there is a natural generalization of Theorem 1.1 to the measure μ_p for $p < 1/2$.

We answer Kalai's question in the affirmative by showing that the most natural such generalization does not hold for arbitrary families, but does hold (even for $p > 1/2$) under the additional assumption that the family is monotone increasing. (We say a family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ is *monotone increasing* if $(S \in \mathcal{F},\ S \subset T) \Rightarrow T \in \mathcal{F}$.)

In order to present our result, we first define the appropriate generalization of lexicographic families for the biased-measure setting. For $s \in [2^n]$, we denote by $\mathcal{L}_{\frac{s}{2^n}}$ the lexicographic family with s elements. (Of course, $\mu_{1/2}(\mathcal{L}_{\frac{s}{2^n}}) = s/2^n$.) Note that while in the uniform-measure case, for any $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ there exists a lexicographic family $\mathcal{L}_{\frac{s}{2^n}}$ with the same measure, this does not hold for $p \neq 1/2$. Hence, we define families $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ for general $\lambda \in (0,1)$, as *limits* of families $\mathcal{L}_{\frac{s}{2^n}}$, where $\frac{s}{2^n} \to \lambda$. (See Section 5 for the formal definition.) These 'limit' families $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$ are measurable subsets of the Cantor space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$; they satisfy

$$\mu_p(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mu_p\left(\mathcal{L}_{\lfloor \lambda 2^n \rfloor / 2^n}\right) \tag{1.6}$$

and

$$I^p[\mathcal{L}_\lambda] = \lim_{n\to\infty} I^p\left[\mathcal{L}_{\lfloor \lambda 2^n \rfloor / 2^n}\right]. \tag{1.7}$$

In fact, the two properties (1.6) and (1.7) are all we need to state and prove our theorem, which is as follows.

Theorem 1.10. *Let $\lambda, p \in (0,1)$, and let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ be a monotone increasing family with $\mu_p(\mathcal{F}) = \mu_p(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)$. Then $I^p[\mathcal{F}] \geq I^p[\mathcal{L}_\lambda]$.*

Our proof uses the Kruskal-Katona theorem [26, 28] and the Margulis-Russo Lemma [31, 32]. In fact, Theorem 1.1 (the 'full' edge-isoperimetric inequality of

Harper, Bernstein, Lindsey and Hart) follows quickly from Theorem 1.10, via a monotonization argument, so our proof of Theorem 1.10 provides a new proof of Theorem 1.1, via the Kruskal-Katona theorem. This may be of independent interest, and may be somewhat surprising, as the Kruskal-Katona theorem is more immediately connected to the vertex-boundary of an increasing family, than to its edge-boundary.

We remark that the assertion of Theorem 1.10 is false for arbitrary (i.e., non-monotone) functions, for each value of $p \neq 1/2$. Indeed, it is easy to check that for each $p \in (0,1) \setminus \{\frac{1}{2}\}$, the 'antidictatorship' $\mathcal{A} = \{S \subset [n] : \ 1 \notin S\}$ has $I^p[\mathcal{A}] = 1 < I^p[\mathcal{L}_\lambda]$, where λ is such that $\mu_p(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) = 1 - p \ (= \mu_p(\mathcal{A}))$.

1.6. **Organization of the paper.** In Section 2, we outline some notation and present an inductive proof of Theorem 1.6, some of whose ideas and components we will use in the sequel. In Section 3 (the longest part of the paper), we prove Theorems 1.7 and 1.9. In Section 4, we give examples showing that Theorems 1.7 and 1.9 are sharp (in a certain sense). In Section 5, we prove Theorem 1.10 and show how to use it to deduce Theorem 1.1. We conclude the paper with some open problems in Section 6.

2. An inductive proof of Theorem 1.6

In this section, we outline some notation and terminology, and present a simple inductive proof of Theorem 1.6; components and ideas from this proof will be used in the proofs of Theorems 1.7 and 1.9.

2.1. **Notation and terminology.** When the 'bias' p (of the measure μ_p) is clear from the context (including throughout Sections 2 and 3), we will sometimes omit it from our notation, i.e. we will sometimes write $\mu(f) := \mu_p(f)$ and $I[f] := I^p[f]$. Moreover, when the Boolean function f is clear from the context, we will sometimes omit if from our notation, i.e. we will sometimes write $\mu := \mu(f)$, $I := I[f]$ and $I_i := I_i[f]$. If $S \subset \{0,1\}^n$, we write 1_S for its indicator function, i.e. the Boolean function on $\{0,1\}^n$ taking the value 1 on S and 0 outside S. A *dictatorship* is a Boolean function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ of the form $f = 1_{\{x_j=1\}}$ for some $j \in [n]$; an *antidictatorship* is one of the form $f = 1_{\{x_j=0\}}$. Abusing notation slightly, we will sometimes identify a family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ with the corresponding indicator function $1_{\{x \in \{0,1\}^n : \ \{i \in [n] : \ x_i = 1\} \in \mathcal{F}\}}$. We use the convention $0 \log_p(0) = 0$ (for all $p \in (0,1)$); this turns $x \mapsto x \log_p(x)$ into a continuous function on $[0,1]$.

If $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ and $i \in [n]$, we define the function $f_{i \to 0} : \{0,1\}^{[n] \setminus \{i\}} \to \{0,1\}$ by $f_{i \mapsto 0}(y) = f(x)$, where $x_i = 0$ and $x_j = y_j$ for all $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$. In other words, $f_{i \to 0}$ is the restriction of f to the lower half-cube $\{x \in \{0,1\}^n : x_i = 0\}$. We define $f_{i \to 1}$ similarly. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i^- &= \mu_i^-(f) := \mu_p(f_{i \to 0}), \\ \mu_i^+ &= \mu_i^+(f) := \mu_p(f_{i \to 1}), \\ I_i^- &= I_i^-[f] := I^p[f_{i \to 0}], \\ I_i^+ &= I_i^+[f] := I^p[f_{i \to 1}]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$p\mu_i^+(f) + (1-p)\mu_i^-(f) = \mu(f) \tag{2.1}$$

and that

$$I[f] = I_i[f] + pI_i^+[f] + (1-p)\, I_i^-[f]. \tag{2.2}$$

2.2. **A proof of Theorem 1.6.** The proof uses induction on n together with equations (2.1) and (2.2), and the following technical lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $p \in (0,1)$, and let $F, G, H\colon\ [0,1]\times[0,1] \to [0,\infty)$ be the functions defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} F(x,y) &= px\log_p x + (1-p)\, y\log_p y + px - py, \\ G(x,y) &= (px + (1-p)\, y)\log_p\left((px + (1-p)\, y)\right), \\ H(x,y) &= px\log_p x + (1-p)\, y\log_p y + py - px. \end{aligned}$$

(1) *If $x \geq y \geq 0$, then $F(x,y) \geq G(x,y)$.*
(2) *If $y \geq x \geq 0$ and $p \leq \frac{1}{2}$, then $H(x,y) \geq G(x,y)$.*

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Clearly, for all $y \geq 0$ we have $F(y,y) = G(y,y) = H(y,y)$, and for all $x, y \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F}{\partial x} &= p\log_p x + \frac{p}{\ln p} + p = p\log_p(px) + \frac{p}{\ln p}, \\ \frac{\partial G}{\partial x} &= p\log_p\left(px + (1-p)\, y\right) + \frac{p}{\ln p}, \\ \frac{\partial H}{\partial y} &= (1-p)\log_p y + p + \frac{1-p}{\ln p} \\ &= (1-p)\log_p((1-p)\, y) - (1-p)\log_p(1-p) + p + \frac{1-p}{\ln p}, \\ \frac{\partial G}{\partial y} &= (1-p)\log_p\left(px + (1-p)\, y\right) + \frac{1-p}{\ln p}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Clearly, we have $\frac{\partial F(x,y)}{\partial x} \geq \frac{\partial G(x,y)}{\partial x}$ for all $x, y \geq 0$, and therefore $F(x,y) \geq G(x,y)$ for all $x \geq y \geq 0$, proving (1). We assert that similarly, $\frac{\partial H(x,y)}{\partial y} \geq \frac{\partial G(x,y)}{\partial y}$ for all $x, y \geq 0$, if $p \leq 1/2$. (This will imply (2).) Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial H}{\partial y} &= (1-p)\log_p((1-p)\, y) - (1-p)\log_p(1-p) + p + \frac{1-p}{\ln p} \\ &\geq \frac{\partial G}{\partial y} + p - (1-p)\log_p(1-p). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it suffices to prove the following.

Claim 2.2. *Define $K : (0,1) \to \mathbb{R}$; $K(p) = p - (1-p)\log_p(1-p)$. Then $K(p) \geq 0$ for all $p \in \left[0, \frac{1}{2}\right]$.*

Proof. It suffices to show that $\alpha(p) := K(p)\ln(1/p) = -p\ln p + (1-p)\ln(1-p)$ is non-negative for all $p \in [0, 1/2]$. We have

$$\alpha'''(x) = \frac{1}{x^2} - \frac{1}{(1-x)^2} > 0 \quad \forall x \in (0, 1/2),$$

so $\alpha''(x)$ is strictly increasing on $(0, 1/2)$, and therefore α has no point of inflexion in $(0, 1/2)$. It follows that 0 and $1/2$ are the only solutions of $\alpha(x) = 0$ in $[0, 1/2]$. Since $\alpha'(0) = \infty$, it follows that $\alpha(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in [0, 1/2]$, proving the claim. □

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.1. □

We can now prove Theorem 1.6.

Proof of Theorem 1.6. It is easy to check that the theorem holds for $n = 1$. Let $n \geq 2$, and suppose the statement of the theorem holds when n is replaced by $n-1$. Let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$. Choose any $i \in [n]$. We split into two cases.

Case (a) $\mu_i^- \leq \mu_i^+$.

Applying the induction hypothesis to the functions $f_{i\to 0}$ and $f_{i\to 1}$, and using the fact that $I_i[f] \geq \mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} pI &= (1-p)pI_i^-[f] + p^2 I_i^+[f] + pI_i[f] \\ &\geq (1-p)\mu_i^- \log_p(\mu_i^-) + p\mu_i^+ \log_p(\mu_i^+) + p\left(\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-\right) \\ &= F\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) \geq G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) = \mu \log_p(\mu), \end{aligned}$$

where F and G are as defined in Lemma 2.1.

Case (b) $\mu_i^- \geq \mu_i^+$.

The proof in this case is similar: applying the induction hypothesis to the functions $f_{i\to 0}$ and $f_{i\to 1}$, and using the fact that $I_i[f] \geq \mu_i^- - \mu_i^+$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} pI &= (1-p)pI_i^-[f] + p^2 I_i^+[f] + pI_i[f] \\ &\geq (1-p)\mu_i^- \log_p(\mu_i^-) + p\mu_i^+ \log_p(\mu_i^+) + p\left(\mu_i^- - \mu_i^+\right) \\ &= H\left(\mu^+, \mu_i^-\right) \geq G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) = \mu \log_p(\mu), \end{aligned}$$

using the fact that $p \leq 1/2$. □

We remark that the above proof shows that if f is monotone increasing, then the statement of Theorem 1.6 holds for all $p \in (0,1)$. (Indeed, if f is monotone increasing, then $\mu_i^- \leq \mu_i^+$ for all $i \in [n]$, so the assumption $p \leq 1/2$ is not required.)

3. Proofs of the 'biased' isoperimetric stability theorems

In this section, we prove Theorems 1.7 and 1.9. As the proofs of the two theorems follow the same strategy, we present them in parallel.

The proof of Theorem 1.7 (and similarly, of Theorem 1.9) consists of five steps. Assume that f satisfies the assumptions of the theorem.

(1) We show that for each $i \in [n]$, either $I_i[f]$ is small or else $\min\left\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\right\}$ is 'somewhat' small. In other words, the influences of f are similar to the influences of a subcube.
(2) We show that μ must be either very close to 1 or 'fairly' small, i.e., bounded away from 1 by a constant. (In the proof of Theorem 1.9, the constant may depend on η.)
(3) We show that unless μ is very close to 1, there exists $i \in [n]$ such that $I_i[f]$ is large. This implies that $\min\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\}$ is 'somewhat' small.
(4) We prove two 'bootstrapping' lemmas saying that if μ_i^- is 'somewhat' small, then it must be 'very' small, and that if μ_i^+ is 'somewhat' small, then it must be 'very' small. This implies that f is 'very' close to being contained in a dictatorship or an antidictatorship.
(5) Finally, we prove each theorem by induction on n.

From now on, we let $f\colon \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ such that $pI^p[f] \leq \mu_p(f)(\log_p(\mu_p(f)) + \epsilon)$. By reducing ϵ if necessary, we may assume that $pI[f] = \mu(\log_p(\mu) + \epsilon)$.

3.1. **Relations between the influences of f and the influences of its restrictions $f_{i\to 0}, f_{i\to 1}$.** We define $\epsilon_i^-, \epsilon_i^+$ by

$$pI_i^- = \mu_i^- \left(\log_p(\mu_i^-) + \epsilon_i^-\right), \qquad pI_i^+ = \mu_i^+ \left(\log_p(\mu_i^+) + \epsilon_i^+\right).$$

Note that Theorem 1.6 implies that $\epsilon_i^-, \epsilon_i^+ \geq 0$. We define the functions F, G, H, K as in the proof of Theorem 1.6.

We would now like to express the fact that $I[f]$ is small in terms of $\epsilon_i^-, \epsilon_i^+, \mu_i^-, \mu_i^+$. For each $i \in [n]$ such that $\mu_i^- \leq \mu_i^+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\log_p(\mu) + \epsilon) = pI[f] &= (1-p)pI_i^- + p^2 I_i^+ + pI_i[f] \\ &= (1-p)\mu_i^- \left(\log_p(\mu_i^-) + \epsilon_i^-\right) + p\mu_i^+ \left(\log_p(\mu_i^+) + \epsilon_i^+\right) \\ &\quad + p(\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-) + p(I_i[f] - \mu_i^+ + \mu_i^-); \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

rearranging (3.1) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_i' :&= \mu\epsilon - p\mu_i^+\epsilon_i^+ - (1-p)\,\mu_i^-\,\epsilon_i^- \\ &= p\mu_i^+(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+) + (1-p)\mu_i^-(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^-) \\ &= F\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) - G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) + p\left(I_i[f] - (\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Similarly, for each $i \in [n]$ such that $\mu_i^- \geq \mu_i^+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_i' &:= \mu\epsilon - p\mu_i^+\epsilon_i^+ - (1-p)\,\mu_i^-\,\epsilon_i^- \\ &= p\mu_i^+(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+) + (1-p)\mu_i^-(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^-) \\ &= H\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) - G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) + p\left(I_i[f] - (\mu_i^- - \mu_i^+)\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

This allows us to deduce two facts about the structure of f.

- By Lemma 2.1, we have $\epsilon_i' \geq 0$ for all $i \in [n]$. This implies that either $\epsilon_i^+ \leq \epsilon$ or $\epsilon_i^- \leq \epsilon$. Together with the induction hypothesis, this will imply (in Section 3.6) that either $f_{i\to 0}$ or $f_{i\to 1}$ is structurally close to a subcube.
- $F\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) - G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right)$ (resp. $H\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) - G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right)$) is small whenever $\mu_i^+ \geq \mu_i^-$ (resp. $\mu_i^- \geq \mu_i^+$). Note that the proof of Lemma 2.1 shows that whenever $\mu_i^+ \geq \mu_i^-$ (resp. $\mu_i^- \geq \mu_i^+$) then $F\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right)$ (resp. $H\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right)$) is equal to $G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right)$ only if $\mu_i^+ = \mu_i^-$ or $\mu_i^- = 0$. We will later show (in Claims 3.2-3.4) that if $F\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right)$ (resp. $H\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right)$) is approximately equal to $G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right)$, then either $\min\left\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\right\}$ is small or else $I_i[f]$ is small.

The following lemma will be used to relate μ_i^+ and μ_i^- to $F(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-) - G(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-)$ (or to $H(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-) - G(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-)$), in a more convenient way.

Lemma 3.1. *If $0 < p < 1$ and $x \geq y \geq 0$, then*

$$F(x,y) - G(x,y) \geq p\,(x-y)\log_p\left(\frac{px}{px + (1-p)\,y}\right).$$

If $0 < p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $y \geq x \geq 0$, then

$$H(x,y) - G(x,y) \geq (1-p)\,(y-x)\log_p\left(\frac{(1-p)\,y}{px + (1-p)\,y}\right).$$

If $0 < p \leq e^{-2}$ *and* $y \geq x \geq 0$*, then*

$$H(x,y) - G(x,y) \geq \tfrac{1}{2} p (y-x).$$

Proof. We show that

(3.4)
$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(F(t,y) - G(t,y)\right) \geq p \log_p \left(\frac{px}{px + (1-p)y}\right) \ \forall y \leq t \leq x,\ 0 < p < 1,$$

(3.5)
$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(H(t,y) - G(t,y)\right) \geq (1-p) \log_p \left(\frac{(1-p)y}{px + (1-p)y}\right) \ \forall x \leq t \leq y,\ 0 < p \leq 1/2,$$

(3.6)
$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(H(t,y) - G(t,y)\right) \geq \tfrac{1}{2} p,\ \forall x \leq t \leq y,\ 0 < p \leq e^{-2}.$$

These inequalities will complete the proof of the lemma, by the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus.

Using (2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(F(t,y) - G(t,y)\right) &= p \log_p (pt) + \frac{p}{\ln(p)} - p \log_p \left((1-p)y + pt\right) - \frac{p}{\ln(p)} \\ &= p \log_p \left(\frac{pt}{(1-p)y + pt}\right) \geq p \log_p \left(\frac{px}{(1-p)y + px}\right),\end{aligned}$$

proving (3.4). Similarly, if $p \leq 1/2$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(H(t,y) - G(t,y)\right) &\geq (1-p) \log_p \left(\frac{(1-p)y}{px + (1-p)y}\right) + K(p) \\ &\geq (1-p) \log_p \left(\frac{(1-p)y}{px + (1-p)y}\right),\end{aligned}$$

proving (3.5). It is easy to check that for all $p \leq e^{-2}$, we have $K(p) \geq \frac{p}{2}$. Hence,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(H(t,y) - G(t,y)\right) \geq K(p) \geq \tfrac{p}{2},$$

proving (3.6). □

3.2. **Either $I_i[f]$ is small, or $\min\left\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\right\}$ is small.** We now show that the influences of f are similar to the influences of a subcube. Note that if $f = 1_S$ for a subcube $S = \{x \in \{0,1\}^n : \ x_i = a_i \ \forall i \in T\}$, where $T \subset [n]$ and $a_i \in \{0,1\}$ for all $i \in T$, then $\min\left\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\right\} = 0$ for each $i \in T$, and $I_i[f] = 0$ for each $i \notin T$. We prove that an approximate version of this statement holds, under our hypotheses.

We start with the simplest case, which is $\zeta < p \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for some $\zeta > 0$.

Claim 3.2. *Let* $\zeta > 0$*. There exists* $C_2 = C_2(\zeta) > 0$ *such that if* $\zeta \leq p \leq 1/2$*, then for each* $i \in [n]$*, one of the following holds.*

Case (1): *We have* $I_i[f] \leq C_2 \epsilon_i'$*, and* $\min\left\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\right\} \geq (1 - C_2\epsilon)\,\mu$.
Case (2): *We have* $\min\left\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\right\} \leq C_2 \epsilon_i'$*, and* $I_i[f] \geq (1 - C_2\epsilon)\,\mu$.

Proof of Claim 3.2. By Lemma 3.1 and (3.2), if $\mu_i^- \le \mu_i^+$ then

$$\begin{aligned} p\left(\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-\right)\log_p\left(\frac{p\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right) &\le F\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) - G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) \\ &\le \epsilon_i' - pI_i[f] - p\mu_i^- + p\mu_i^+. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

By Lemma 3.1 and (3.3), if $\mu_i^- \ge \mu_i^+$ then

$$\begin{aligned} (1-p)\left(\mu_i^- - \mu_i^+\right)\log_p\left(\frac{(1-p)\,\mu_i^-}{\mu}\right) &\le H\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) - G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) \\ &\le \epsilon_i' - pI_i[f] - p\mu_i^+ + p\mu_i^-. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Since the right-hand sides of (3.7) and (3.8) are non-negative, we have

$$I_i[f] - \left|\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-\right| \le \tfrac{1}{p}\epsilon_i' \le \tfrac{1}{\zeta}\epsilon_i'. \tag{3.9}$$

We now split into two cases.

Case (a): $\min\left\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\right\} \ge \frac{\mu}{2}$.

In this case, we have

$$p\log_p\left(\frac{p\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right) = \Omega_\zeta(1), \quad (1-p)\log_p\left(\frac{(1-p)\,\mu_i^-}{\mu}\right) = \Omega_\zeta(1),$$

so

$$\left|\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-\right| = O_\zeta\left(\epsilon_i'\right),$$

by (3.7) and (3.8). Equation (3.9) now implies that $I_i[f] = O_\zeta\left(\epsilon_i'\right)$. Therefore, $\min\left\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\right\} \ge \mu - I_i[f] = \mu - O_\zeta(\epsilon_i^{'}) = \mu - O_\zeta(\epsilon\mu) = \mu(1 - O_\zeta(\epsilon))$. Hence, Case (1) of the claim occurs.

Case (b): $\min\left\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\right\} \le \frac{\mu}{2}$.

Firstly, suppose in addition that $\mu_i^- \le \mu_i^+$, so that $\mu_i^- \le \mu/2$. Then $p(\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-) = \Omega_\zeta\left(\mu\right)$, so (3.7) implies that

$$\log_p\left(\frac{p\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right) = O_\zeta(\epsilon_i^{'}/\mu).$$

Hence, $\ln\left(\frac{\mu}{p\mu_i^+}\right) = O_\zeta(\epsilon_i'/\mu)$, and therefore

$$1 + \frac{(1-p)\,\mu_i^-}{p\mu_i^+} = \frac{\mu}{p\mu_i^+} = \exp\left(O_\zeta(\epsilon_i^{'}/\mu)\right) = 1 + O_\zeta(\epsilon_i^{'}/\mu).$$

Therefore, $\mu_i^- = O_\zeta(\epsilon_i^{'})\frac{p\mu_i^+}{(1-p)\mu} = O_\zeta(\epsilon_i^{'})$. We now have $I_i[f] \ge \mu - \mu_i^- = \mu - O_\zeta(\epsilon_i') = \mu - O_\zeta(\epsilon\mu) = (1 - O_\zeta(\epsilon))\mu$. Hence, Case (2) of the claim occurs.

Secondly, suppose in addition that $\mu_i^+ \le \mu_i^-$, so that $\mu_i^+ \le \mu/2$. Then we have $(1-p)(\mu_i^- - \mu_i^+) = \Omega\left(\mu\right)$, so (3.8) implies that

$$\log_p\left(\frac{(1-p)\mu_i^-}{\mu}\right) = O(\epsilon_i^{'}/\mu).$$

Hence, $\ln\left(\frac{\mu}{(1-p)\mu_i^-}\right) = O_\zeta(\epsilon_i'/\mu)$, and therefore

$$1 + \frac{p\mu_i^+}{(1-p)\mu_i^-} = \frac{\mu}{(1-p)\mu_i^-} = \exp\left(O_\zeta(\epsilon_i^{'}/\mu)\right) = 1 + O_\zeta(\epsilon_i^{'}/\mu).$$

Therefore, $\mu_i^+ = O_\zeta(\epsilon_i')\frac{(1-p)\mu_i^-}{p\mu} = O_\zeta(\epsilon_i')$. It follows that $I_i[f] \geq (1 - O_\zeta(\epsilon))\mu$, so again, Case (2) of the claim must occur.

□

We now prove a version of Claim 3.2 for monotone increasing f and for all p bounded away from 1. The idea of the proof is the same, but the details are slightly messier, mainly because p is no longer bounded away from 0.

Claim 3.3. *For any $\eta > 0$, there exists $C_2 = C_2(\eta) > 0$ such that the following holds. Suppose that f is monotone increasing and that $0 < p \leq 1 - \eta$. Let $i \in [n]$. Then one of the following must occur.*

Case (1): *We have $pI_i[f] \leq C_2\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p)$, and $\mu_i^- \geq (1 - C_2\epsilon \ln(1/p))\,\mu$.*
Case (2): *We have $\mu_i^- \leq C_2\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p)$, and $pI_i[f] \geq (1 - C_2\epsilon \ln(1/p))\,\mu$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 and equation (3.2), we have

$$p\mathrm{Inf}_i[f] \log_p\left(\frac{p\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right) = p(\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-) \log_p\left(\frac{p\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right) \leq F\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) - G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) \leq \epsilon_i'.$$

We now split into two cases.

Case (a): $\mu_i^+ \leq (1 - \frac{\eta}{2})\frac{\mu}{p}$.

If $\mu_i^+ \leq (1 - \frac{\eta}{2})\frac{\mu}{p}$, then Case (1) of Claim 3.3 must occur, provided we take C_2 to be sufficiently large. Indeed, we then have

$$pI_i[f] \log_p(1 - \tfrac{\eta}{2}) = p(\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-) \log_p(1 - \tfrac{\eta}{2}) \leq p(\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-) \log_p\left(\frac{p\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right) \leq \epsilon_i',$$

which gives $pI_i[f] \leq \frac{1}{\ln\left(\frac{2}{2-\eta}\right)}\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p) \leq C_2\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p)$, provided we choose $C_2 \geq 1/(\ln(2/(2-\eta)))$. This in turn implies that

$$\mu_i^- = \mu - p(\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-) = \mu - pI_i[f] \geq \mu - C_2\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p) \geq \mu - C_2\epsilon\mu \ln(1/p),$$

so Case (1) occurs, as asserted.

Case (b): $\mu_i^+ \geq \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2}\right)\frac{\mu}{p}$.

If $\mu_i^+ \geq (1 - \frac{\eta}{2})\frac{\mu}{p}$, then Case (2) of Claim 3.3 must occur. Indeed, since $\mu_i^- \leq \mu$, we have $pI_i[f] = p(\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-) \geq \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{2} - p\right)\mu \geq \frac{1}{2}\eta\mu$. We now have

$$\log_p\left(\frac{p\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon_i'}{p(\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-)} \leq \frac{2\epsilon_i'}{\eta\mu} \leq \frac{2\epsilon_i'}{\eta p\mu_i^+}.$$

Hence,

$$\frac{p\mu_i^+}{\mu} \geq p^{2\epsilon_i'/(\eta p\mu_i^+)} = \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p)}{\eta p\mu_i^+}\right).$$

Using the fact that $1 - e^{-x} \leq x$ for all $x \geq 0$, we have

$$(1-p)\,\frac{\mu_i^-}{\mu} = 1 - \frac{p\mu_i^+}{\mu} \leq 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{2\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p)}{\eta p\mu_i^+}\right) \leq \frac{2\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p)}{\eta p\mu_i^+}.$$

This implies

$$\mu_i^- \leq \left(\frac{\mu}{\eta p\mu_i^+}\right)\left(\frac{2}{1-p}\right)\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p) \leq \left(\frac{2}{\eta(2-\eta)}\right)\left(\frac{2}{\eta}\right)\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p) \leq C_2\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p),$$

provided we choose $C_2 \geq \frac{4}{\eta^2(2-\eta)}$. We now have

$$pI_i[f] = p(\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-) = \mu - \mu_i^- \geq \mu - C_2\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p) \geq \mu - C_2\epsilon\mu\ln(1/p),$$

so Case (2) occurs, as asserted. □

We now prove a version of Claim 3.2 for small p and a general f (i.e., not necessarily monotone increasing). Here, similarly to in the monotone case, we obtain that either μ_i^- is small, or else $pI_i[f]$ is small.

Claim 3.4. *There exists an absolute constant $C_2 > 0$ such that if $0 < p \leq e^{-2}$, then for each $i \in [n]$, one of the following holds.*

Case (1): *We have $pI_i[f] \leq C_2\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p)$, and $\mu_i^- \geq (1 - C_2\epsilon\ln(1/p))\,\mu$.*
Case (2): *We have $\mu_i^- \leq C_2\epsilon_i' \ln(1/p)$, and $pI_i[f] \geq (1 - C_2\epsilon\ln(1/p))\,\mu$.*

Proof. By (3.9), we have

$$pI_i[f] - p\left|\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-\right| \leq \epsilon_i'. \tag{3.10}$$

Firstly, suppose that $\mu_i^- \geq \mu_i^+$; then $\mu_i^- \geq \mu$, so clearly we have $\mu_i^- \geq (1 - C_2\epsilon\ln(1/p))\mu$ for any $C_2 > 0$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.1 and (3.3), we have

$$\left(\mu_i^- - \mu_i^+\right)\tfrac{p}{2} \leq H\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) - G\left(\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\right) \leq \epsilon_i^{'} \tag{3.11}$$

Combining (3.10) and (3.11) yields $pI_i[f] \leq 3\epsilon_i'$, so Case (1) holds.

Secondly, suppose that $\mu_i^+ > \mu_i^-$. The proof of Claim 3.3 (replacing $I_i[f]$ with $\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-$ in the appropriate places, and then using (3.10) to bound $I_i[f]$ in terms of $|\mu_i^+ - \mu_i^-|$) now implies that either Case (1) or Case (2) holds, provided we take $C_2 = C_2(\eta)$, where $\eta \leq 1 - e^{-2}$. □

3.3. **Either μ is fairly small, or very close to 1.** Here, we show that there exists a constant $c_4 > 0$ such that either $\mu = 1 - O\left(\frac{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)}\right)$ (i.e., μ is very close to 1), or else $\mu < 1 - c_4$ (i.e., μ is bounded away from 1). For a general f (and $0 < p \leq 1/2$), we obtain this by applying the p-biased isoperimetric inequality to the complement of f: $\tilde{f}\,(x) = 1 - f\,(x)$. For monotone f (and $0 < p < 1$), we apply the p-biased isoperimetric inequality to the dual of f: $f^*(x) = 1 - f\,(\overline{x}) = 1 - f(1-x)$.

Claim 3.5. *Let $0 < p \leq 1/2$. Then we either have*

$$\mu \geq 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)},$$

or else $\mu \leq 1 - c_4$, where $C_3, c_4 > 0$ are absolute constants.

Proof. Note that $\mu_p(\tilde{f}) = 1 - \mu_p(f)$ and that $I^p[\tilde{f}] = I^p[f]$. By assumption, we have $pI[f] = \mu(\log_p\mu + \epsilon)$. On the other hand, applying Theorem 1.6 to $\tilde{f}$, we obtain

$$pI[f] = pI[\tilde{f}] \geq (1-\mu)\log_p(1-\mu).$$

Combining these two facts, we obtain

$$\mu\left(\log_p\mu + \epsilon\right) \geq (1-\mu)\log_p(1-\mu).$$

Suppose that $\delta := 1-\mu \le c_4$, where $c_4 > 0$ is to be chosen later. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta \log_p(\delta) &\le (1-\delta)\left(\log_p(1-\delta)+\epsilon\right)\\ &= (1-\delta)\left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)}+\epsilon\right) \le \frac{2\delta}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)}+\epsilon,\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds provided c_4 is sufficiently small. Hence,

$$\delta\left(\ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)-2\right) \le \epsilon \ln\left(\frac{1}{p}\right).$$

Provided c_4 is sufficiently small, this implies that

$$\delta = O\left(\frac{\epsilon \ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon \ln(1/p)}\right)}\right),$$

proving the claim. □

Claim 3.6. *For any $\eta > 0$, there exist $C_3 = C_3(\eta)$ and $c_4 = c_4(\eta) > 0$ such that the following holds. Suppose that $0 < p \le 1-\eta$, and suppose that f is monotone increasing. Then we either have*

$$\mu \ge 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)},$$

or else $\mu \le 1 - c_4$.

Proof. Note that $\mu_{1-p}(f^*) = 1-\mu_p(f)$ and that $I^{1-p}[f^*] = I^p[f]$. By assumption, we have $pI^p[f] = \mu(\log_p \mu + \epsilon)$. On the other hand, applying Theorem 1.6 to f^*, we obtain

$$(1-p)I^p[f] = (1-p)I^{1-p}[f^*] \ge (1-\mu)\log_{1-p}(1-\mu).$$

Combining these two facts, we obtain

$$\mu\left(\log_p \mu + \epsilon\right) \ge \frac{p}{1-p}(1-\mu)\log_{1-p}(1-\mu).$$

Suppose that $\delta := 1-\mu \le c_4$, where $c_4 = c_4(\eta) > 0$ is to be chosen later. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{p}{1-p}\delta\log_{1-p}(\delta) &\le (1-\delta)\left(\log_p(1-\delta)+\epsilon\right)\\ &= (1-\delta)\left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-\delta}\right)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)}+\epsilon\right) \le \frac{2\delta}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)}+\epsilon,\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where the last inequality holds provided c_4 is sufficiently small. Observe that $\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-p}\right) = \Theta_\eta(p)$. Hence,

$$\frac{p}{1-p}\delta\log_{1-p}(\delta) = \frac{p}{1-p}\delta\frac{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{1-p}\right)} = \Theta_\eta\left(\frac{p}{1-p}\delta\frac{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}{p}\right) = \Theta_\eta\left(\delta\ln\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right). \tag{3.13}$$

Combining (3.12) and (3.13), we obtain

$$\Theta_\eta(\delta\ln(1/\delta)) - \frac{2\delta}{\eta} \le \Theta_\eta(\delta\ln(1/\delta)) - \frac{2\delta}{\ln(1/p)} \le \epsilon,$$

which implies that

$$\delta = O_\eta\left(\frac{\epsilon}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)}\right)$$

provided c_4 is sufficiently small depending on η, proving the claim. □

3.4. **There exists an influential coordinate.** We now show that unless μ is very close to 1, there must exist a coordinate whose influence is large. This coordinate will be used in the inductive step of the proof of our two stability theorems. First, we deal with the case of small p and general f (i.e., f not necessarily monotone increasing).

Claim 3.7. *There exists an absolute constant $\zeta \in (0, c_4)$ such that the following holds. Let $0 < p < \zeta$. If $\mu < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)}$, then there exists $i \in [n]$ for which Case (2) of Claim 3.4 occurs, i.e. $\mu_i^- \le C_2\epsilon_i'\ln(1/p)$ and $pI_i[f] \ge (1 - C_2\epsilon\ln(1/p))\mu$. (Here, C_2 is the absolute constant from Claim 3.4, and C_3, c_4 are the absolute constants from Claim 3.5.)*

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on n.

If $n = 1$ and $\mu < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)}$, then by Claim 3.5, we have $\mu < 1 - c_4$, and therefore $f \equiv 0$ or $f = 1_{\{x_1=1\}}$. (If $f = 1_{\{x_1=0\}}$ then $\mu = 1 - p > 1 - c_4$, provided $\zeta < c_4$.) Hence, we have $\mu_1^- = 0$, so Case (2) must occur for the coordinate 1, verifying the base case.

We now do the inductive step. Let $n \ge 2$, and assume the claim holds when n is replaced by $n-1$. Let f be as in the statement of the claim; then by Claim 3.5, we have $\mu \le 1 - c_4$. Suppose for a contradiction that f has Case (1) of Claim 3.4 occurring for each $i \in [n]$. First, suppose that $\epsilon_i^- \ge \epsilon$ for each $i \in [n]$. Fix any $i \in [n]$. By (3.2), we have $0 \le \epsilon_i' \le p(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+)\mu_i^+$, so $\epsilon_i^+ \le \epsilon$ and therefore

$$I_i[f] \le \tfrac{1}{p}C_2\epsilon_i'\ln(1/p) \le C_2\left(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+\right)\mu_i^+\ln(1/p) \le C_2c_0\mu_i^+. \tag{3.14}$$

Hence,

$$\mu_i^+ - \mu \le \mu_i^+ - \mu_i^- \le I_i[f] \le C_2c_0\mu_i^+,$$

so

$$\mu_i^+ \le \frac{\mu}{1 - C_2c_0} \le \frac{1 - c_4}{1 - C_2c_0} < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)} \le 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon_i^+\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_i^+\ln(1/p)}\right)},$$

provided c_0 is sufficiently small. It follows that $f_{i\to 1}$ satisfies the hypothesis of the claim, for each $i \in [n]$. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exists $j \in [n]\setminus\{i\}$ such that $f_{i\to 1}$ has Case (2) of Claim 3.4 occurring for the coordinate j, so

$$pI_j[f_{i\to 1}] \ge \left(1 - C_2\epsilon_i^+\ln(1/p)\right)\mu_i^+.$$

We now have

$$I_j[f] \ge pI_j[f_{i\to 1}] \ge \left(1 - C_2\epsilon_i^+\ln(1/p)\right)\mu_i^+ \ge (1 - C_2\epsilon\ln(1/p))\mu_i^+ \ge (1 - C_2c_0)\mu_i^+,$$

but this contradicts the fact that (3.14) holds when i is replaced by j (provided c_0 is sufficiently small).

We may assume henceforth that there exists $i \in [n]$ such that $\epsilon_i^- < \epsilon$. Fix such a coordinate i. Since Case (1) occurs for the coordinate i, we have

$$\mu_i^- \ge (1 - C_2\epsilon\ln(1/p))\mu \ge (1 - C_2c_0)\mu.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\mu_i^- \leq \frac{\mu}{1-p} \leq \frac{1-c_4}{1-\zeta} < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)} < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon_i^-\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_i^-\ln(1/p)}\right)},$$

provided ζ is sufficiently small. Hence, $f_{i\to 0}$ satisfies the hypotheses of the claim. Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, there exists $j \in [n]\setminus\{i\}$ such that $f_{i\to 0}$ has Case (2) of Claim 3.4 occurring for the coordinate j, so

$$pI_j[f_{i\to 0}] \geq \left(1 - C_2\epsilon_i^-\ln(1/p)\right)\mu_i^-.$$

We now have

$$\begin{aligned} pI_j[f] &\geq p(1-p)I_j[f_{i\to 0}] \geq (1-p)\left(1 - C_2\epsilon_i^-\ln(1/p)\right)\mu_i^- \\ &> (1-p)\left(1 - C_2\epsilon\ln(1/p)\right)(1-C_2c_0)\mu \geq \tfrac{1}{2}(1-C_2c_0)^2\mu, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting the fact that f satisfies Case (1) of Claim 3.4 for the coordinate j, provided c_0 is sufficiently small. This completes the inductive step, proving the claim. □

Now we deal with the case of constant p ($\leq 1/2$) and general f.

Claim 3.8. *For each $\zeta > 0$, the following holds provided c_0 sufficiently small depending on ζ. Let $\zeta < p \leq 1/2$. If $\mu < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)}$, then there exists $i \in [n]$ for which Case (2) of Claim 3.2 occurs, i.e. $\min\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\} \leq C_2\epsilon_i'$ and $pI_i[f] \geq (1-C_2\epsilon)\mu$. (Here, C_3 is the constant from Claim 3.5, and $C_2 = C_2(\zeta)$ is the constant from Claim 3.2.)*

Proof. If $n = 1$ and $\mu < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)}$, then we must have either $f \equiv 0$, $f = 1_{\{x_1=1\}}$ or $f = 1_{\{x_1=0\}}$. Hence, we have $\min\{\mu_i^+, \mu_1^-\} = 0$, so Case (2) of Claim 3.2 must occur for the coordinate 1, verifying the base case.

We now do the inductive step. Let $n \geq 2$, and assume the claim holds when n is replaced by $n-1$. Let f be as in the statement of the claim; then by Claim 3.5, we have $\mu \leq 1 - c_4$. Suppose for a contradiction that f has Case (1) of Claim 3.2 occurring for each $i \in [n]$. First, suppose that $\epsilon_i^- \geq \epsilon$ for each $i \in [n]$. Then almost exactly the same argument as in the proof of Claim 3.7 yields a contradiction, provided c_0 is sufficiently small depending on ζ. Therefore, we may assume henceforth that there exists $i \in [n]$ such that $\epsilon_i^- < \epsilon$. By assumption, Case 1 of Claim 3.2 occurs for the coordinate i, and therefore $\min\{\mu_i^+, \mu_i^-\} \geq (1-C_2\epsilon)\mu$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i^- = \frac{\mu - p\mu_i^+}{1-p} \leq \frac{1-p(1-C_2\epsilon)}{1-p}\mu = \mu + \frac{pC_2\epsilon\mu}{1-p} \leq 1 - c_4 + C_2\epsilon < \\ < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)} < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon_i^-\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_i^-\ln(1/p)}\right)}, \end{aligned}$$

provided c_0 is sufficiently small depending on ζ. Hence, $f_{i\to 0}$ satisfies the hypotheses of the claim. Therefore, by the induction hypothesis, there exists $j \in [n]\setminus\{i\}$ such that $f_{i\to 0}$ has Case (2) of Claim 3.4 occurring for the coordinate j, so

$$I_j[f_{i\to 0}] \geq \left(1 - C_2\epsilon_i^-\right)\mu_i^-.$$

We now have

$$\begin{aligned} I_j[f] &\geq (1-p)I_j[f_{i\to 0}] \geq (1-p)\left(1-C_2\epsilon_i^-\right)\mu_i^- \\ &> (1-p)\left(1-C_2\epsilon\right)^2\mu \geq \tfrac{1}{2}(1-C_2c_0/\ln(2))^2\mu, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting the fact that f satisfies Case (1) of Claim 3.2 for the coordinate j, provided c_0 is sufficiently small depending on C_2 (i.e., on ζ). This completes the inductive step, proving the claim. □

Finally, we deal with the case of monotone f and all p bounded away from 1.

Claim 3.9. *For each $\eta > 0$, the following holds provided c_0 is sufficiently small depending on η. Let $0 < p \leq 1-\eta$, and suppose f is monotone increasing. If $\mu < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)}$, then there exists $i \in [n]$ for which Case (2) of Claim 3.3 occurs. (Here, $C_3 = C_3(\eta)$ is the constant from Claim 3.6.)*

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on n.

If $n = 1$ and $\mu < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)}$, then since $\mu < 1$ we must have either $f \equiv 0$ or $f = 1_{\{x_1=1\}}$, so $\mu_1^- = 0$. Hence, Case (2) of Claim 3.3 occurs for the coordinate 1, verifying the base case.

We now do the inductive step. Let $n \geq 2$, and assume the claim holds when n is replaced by $n-1$. Let f be as in the statement of the claim; then by Claim 3.6, we have $\mu \leq 1 - c_4$. Suppose for a contradiction that f has Case (1) of Claim 3.3 occurring for each $i \in [n]$. First, suppose that $\epsilon_i^- \geq \epsilon$ for each $i \in [n]$. Fix any $i \in [n]$. Then almost exactly the same argument as in the proof of Claim 3.7 (using Claim 3.6 in place of Claim 3.5) yields a contradiction.

We may therefore assume henceforth that there exists $i \in [n]$ such that $\epsilon_i^- < \epsilon$. Since Case (1) of Claim 3.3 occurs for the coordinate i, we have

$$\mu_i^- \geq (1 - C_2\epsilon\ln(1/p))\mu \geq (1-C_2c_0)\mu.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\mu_i^- \leq \mu < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)} < 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon_i^-\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_i^-\ln(1/p)}\right)},$$

so $f_{i\to 0}$ satisfies the hypotheses of the claim. Hence, by the induction hypothesis, there exists $j \in [n]\setminus\{i\}$ such that $f_{i\to 0}$ has Case (2) of Claim 3.3 occurring for the coordinate j, so

$$pI_j[f_{i\to 0}] \geq \left(1 - C_2\epsilon_i^-\ln(1/p)\right)\mu_i^-.$$

We now have

$$\begin{aligned} pI_j[f] &\geq p(1-p)I_j[f_{i\to 0}] \geq (1-p)\left(1-C_2\epsilon_i^-\ln(1/p)\right)\mu_i^- \\ &> (1-p)\left(1-C_2\epsilon\ln(1/p)\right)(1-C_2c_0)\mu \geq \eta(1-C_2c_0)^2\mu, \end{aligned}$$

contradicting the fact that f satisfies Case (1) of Claim 3.3 for the coordinate j, provided c_0 is sufficiently small depending on η. This completes the inductive step, proving the claim. □

3.5. **Bootstrapping.** Our final required ingredient is a 'bootstrapping' argument, which says that if $\min\left\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\right\}$ is 'somewhat' small, then it must be 'very' small.

Claim 3.10. *Let $\zeta \in (0,1/2)$. There exist $C_5 = C_5(\zeta) > 0$ and $c_5 > 0$ such that the following holds. Let $\zeta < p \leq \frac{1}{2}$. If $\mu_i^- \leq c_5\mu$, then*

$$\mu_i^- \leq \frac{C_5\left(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+\right)\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(1/\left(\left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+\right)\ln(1/p)\right)\right)}\mu,$$

and if $\mu_i^+ \leq c_5\mu$, then

$$\mu_i^+ \leq \frac{C_5\left(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^-\right)\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(1/\left(\left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^-\right)\ln(1/p)\right)\right)}\mu.$$

Proof. First suppose that $\mu_i^- \leq \mu_i^+$, and define $\delta := \mu_i^-/\mu$. Using (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}(1-p)\,\mu_i^-\log_p\left(\mu_i^-\right) + p\mu_i^+\log_p\mu_i^+ - \mu\log_p\mu + pI_i\left[f\right] &\\ = \left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+\right)p\mu_i^+ + \left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^-\right)(1-p)\,\mu_i^- &\\ \leq \left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+\right)\mu + \epsilon\,(1-p)\,\mu_i^-. &\qquad (3.15)\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{LHS} &= (1-p)\,\mu_i^-\log_p\left(\mu_i^-\right) + p\mu_i^+\log_p\left(p\mu_i^+\right) - \mu\log_p\mu + pI_i\left[f\right] - p\mu_i^+\\ &\geq (1-p)\,\mu_i^-\log_p\left(\mu_i^-\right) + p\mu_i^+\log_p\left(\mu\right) - \mu\log_p\left(\mu\right) - p\mu_i^-\\ &= (1-p)\,\mu_i^-\log_p\left(\frac{\mu_i^-}{\mu}\right) - p\mu_i^-. \qquad (3.16)\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.15) and (3.16) and rearranging, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\mu_i^-}{\mu}\right)\left(\log_p\left(\frac{\mu_i^-}{\mu}\right) - \frac{p}{1-p} - \epsilon\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+}{1-p} \leq 2(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+). \qquad (3.17)$$

It follows that

$$\delta\left(\ln(1/\delta) - \frac{p\ln(1/p)}{1-p} - \epsilon\ln(1/p)\right) \leq 2(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+)\ln(1/p),$$

and therefore

$$\delta\left(\ln(1/\delta) - \frac{2}{e} - c_0\right) \leq 2(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+)\ln(1/p).$$

If c_5 is a small enough absolute constant, this clearly implies that

$$\delta = O_\zeta\left(\frac{(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+)\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+)\ln(1/p)}\right)}\right),$$

as required.

Now suppose that $\mu_i^+ \leq \mu_i^-$, and define $\delta := \mu_i^+/\mu$. Using (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}(1-p)\,\mu_i^-\log_p\left(\mu_i^-\right) + p\mu_i^+\log_p\mu_i^+ - \mu\log_p\mu + pI_i\left[f\right] &\\ = \left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+\right)p\mu_i^+ + \left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^-\right)(1-p)\,\mu_i^- &\\ \leq \epsilon p\mu_i^+ + (\epsilon-\epsilon_i^-)\mu. &\qquad (3.18)\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{LHS} &= (1-p)\,\mu_i^- \log_p\left((1-p)\mu_i^-\right) + p\mu_i^+ \log_p\left(\mu_i^+\right) - \mu\log_p(\mu) + pI_i\left[f\right]\\ &\quad - (1-p)\mu_i^- \log_p(1-p)\\ &\geq (1-p)\,\mu_i^- \log_p(\mu) + p\mu_i^+ \log_p\left(\mu_i^+\right) - \mu\log_p(\mu) + p(\mu_i^- - \mu_i^+)\\ &\quad - (1-p)\mu_i^- \log_p(1-p)\\ &= p\mu_i^+ \log_p\left(\frac{\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right) + \mu_i^-(p-(1-p)\log_p(1-p)) - p\mu_i^+\\ &= p\mu_i^+ \log_p\left(\frac{\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right) + K(p)\mu_i^- - p\mu_i^+\\ &\geq p\mu_i^+ \log_p\left(\frac{\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right) - p\mu_i^+. \qquad (3.19)\end{aligned}$$

Combining (3.18) and (3.19) and rearranging, we obtain

$$\left(\frac{\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right)\left(\log_p\left(\frac{\mu_i^+}{\mu}\right) - 1 - \epsilon\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon-\epsilon_i^-}{p} \leq \tfrac{1}{\zeta}(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^-). \qquad (3.20)$$

It follows that

$$\delta\left(\ln(1/\delta) - \ln(1/p) - \epsilon\ln(1/p)\right) \leq \tfrac{1}{\zeta}(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^-)\ln(1/p),$$

and therefore

$$\delta\left(\ln(1/\delta) - \ln(1/\zeta) - c_0\right) \leq \tfrac{1}{\zeta}(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^-)\ln(1/p).$$

If c_5 is small enough depending on ζ, this clearly implies that

$$\delta = O_\zeta\left(\frac{(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^-)\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^-)\ln(1/p)}\right)}\right),$$

as required. □

We now prove a bootstrapping claim suitable for use in the cases where $p \leq \zeta$ or where f is monotone and $p \leq 1-\eta$.

Claim 3.11. *Let $\eta > 0$. There exist $C_5 = C_5(\eta) > 0$ and $c_5 = c_5(\eta) > 0$ such that if $p \leq 1-\eta$ and $\mu_i^- \leq c_5\mu$, then*

$$\mu_i^- \leq \frac{C_5\left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+\right)\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(1/\left(\left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+\right)\ln(1/p)\right)\right)}\mu.$$

Proof. As in the proof of Claim 3.10, we have

$$\left(\frac{\mu_i^-}{\mu}\right)\left(\log_p\left(\frac{\mu_i^-}{\mu}\right) - \frac{p}{1-p} - \epsilon\right) \leq \frac{\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+}{1-p} \leq \frac{\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+}{\eta}. \qquad (3.21)$$

Writing $\delta := \frac{\mu_i^-}{\mu} \leq c_5$, we obtain

$$\delta\left(\ln(1/\delta) - \frac{1}{e\eta} - c_0\right) \leq \delta\ln(1/\delta) - \frac{p\ln(1/p)}{1-p} - \epsilon\ln(1/p) \leq \ln(1/p)O_\eta\left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+\right).$$

Provided $c_5 = c_5(\eta) > 0$ is sufficiently small, this implies that

$$\delta = O_\eta\left(\frac{\left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+\right)\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(1/\left(\left(\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+\right)\ln(1/p)\right)\right)}\right),$$

as required. □

3.6. **Inductive proofs of Theorems 1.7 and 1.9.**

Proof of Theorem 1.7. First, we deal with the case of $p < \zeta$, where ζ is the absolute constant from Claim 3.7. In this case, we prove that the conclusion of Theorem 1.7 holds with S a monotone increasing subcube.

We proceed by induction on n. If $n = 1$, then f is the indicator function of a monotone increasing subcube unless $f = 1_{\{x_1=0\}}$, so we may assume that $f = 1_{\{x_1=0\}}$. Then $\mu_p(f) = 1 - p > 1 - \zeta > 1 - c_4$, so by Claim 3.5, we have

$$\mu_p(f) \geq 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon \ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon \ln(1/p)}\right)},$$

so the conclusion of the theorem holds with $S = \{0,1\}$.

We now do the inductive step. Let $n \geq 2$, and assume that Theorem 1.7 holds when n is replaced by $n-1$. Let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1.7. We may assume throughout that $\mu_p(f) \leq 1 - c_4$, otherwise by Claim 3.5, we have

$$\mu_p(f) \geq 1 - \frac{C_3\epsilon \ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon \ln(1/p)}\right)},$$

so the conclusion of the theorem holds with $S = \{0,1\}^n$. Since $\mu_p(f) \leq 1 - c_4$, by Claim 3.7, there exists $i \in [n]$ such that $\mu_i^- \leq C_2\epsilon\mu \ln(1/p)$, so if c_0 is a sufficiently small absolute constant, we have $\mu_i^- \leq c_5\mu$, i.e. μ_i^- satisfies the hypothesis of Claim 3.10. Therefore, by Claim 3.10, we have

$$\mu_i^- \leq \frac{C_5\left(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+\right)\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(1/\left(\left(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+\right)\ln(1/p)\right)\right)}\mu, \tag{3.22}$$

and so $\epsilon_i^+ \leq \epsilon$. By applying the induction hypothesis to $f_{i\to 1}$, we obtain

$$\mu_p\left(f_{i\to 1}\Delta 1_{S_T}\right) \leq \frac{C_1\epsilon_i^+ \ln(1/p)\mu_i^+}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_i^+ \ln(1/p)}\right)}$$

for some monotone increasing subcube $S_T = \{x \in \{0,1\}^{[n]\setminus\{i\}} : \ x_j = 1 \ \forall j \in T\}$, where $T \subset [n]$. Therefore, writing

$$S_{T\cup\{i\}} := \{x \in \{0,1\}^n : \ x_j = 1 \ \forall j \in T \cup \{i\}\},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_p\left(f\Delta 1_{S_{T\cup\{i\}}}\right) &\leq (1-p)\,\mu_i^- + p\mu_p\left(f_{i\to 1}\Delta 1_{S_T}\right) \\
&\leq (1-p)\left(\frac{C_5(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+)\ln(1/p)\mu}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\left[\epsilon-\epsilon_i^+\right]\ln(1/p)}\right)}\right) + \frac{C_1\epsilon_i^+ \ln(1/p)p\mu_i^+}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_i^+ \ln(1/p)}\right)} \\
&\leq \frac{\left(C_5\left(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+\right) + C_1\epsilon_i^+\right)\mu\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)} \leq \frac{C_1\epsilon\mu\ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)},
\end{aligned}$$

provided $C_1 \geq C_5$, using (3.22). Hence, the conclusion of the theorem holds with $S = S_{T\cup\{i\}}$. This completes the inductive step, proving the theorem in the case $p < \zeta$.

Now we prove the theorem in the case $\zeta \le p \le 1/2$. (In this case, we do not prove that the subcube S is monotone increasing; see Remark 1.8.)

We proceed again by induction on n. If $n = 1$, then as before the theorem holds trivially. Let $n \ge 2$, and assume Theorem 1.7 holds when n is replaced by $n-1$. Let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1.7. As before, we may assume throughout that $\mu_p(f) \le 1 - c_4$, otherwise by Claim 3.5, we have

$$\mu_p(f) \ge 1 - \frac{C_3 \epsilon \ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon \ln(1/p)}\right)},$$

so the conclusion of the theorem holds with $S = \{0,1\}^n$. Since $\mu_p(f) \le 1 - c_4$, by Claim 3.8 (applied with the specific choice of ζ above, i.e. from Claim 3.7), there exists $i \in [n]$ such that $\min\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\} \le C_2 \epsilon_i' \le C_2 \epsilon \mu$, so if c_0 is a sufficiently small absolute constant, we have $\min\{\mu_i^-, \mu_i^+\} \le c_5 \mu$, i.e. μ_i^- or μ_i^+ satisfies the hypothesis of Claim 3.10 (again with the above choice of ζ). Suppose that $\mu_i^- \le c_5 \mu$ (the other case is very similar). Then, by Claim 3.10, we have $\epsilon_i^+ \le \epsilon$. By applying the induction hypothesis to $f_{i \to 1}$, we obtain

$$\mu_p\left(f_{i\to 1} \Delta 1_{S'}\right) \le \frac{C_1 \epsilon_i^+ \ln(1/p) \mu_i^+}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_i^+ \ln(1/p)}\right)}$$

for some subcube $S' = \{x \in \{0,1\}^{[n]\setminus\{i\}} : \ x_j = a_j \ \forall j \in T\}$, where $T \subset [n]$ and $a_j \in \{0,1\}$ for each $j \in T$. Therefore, writing

$$S := \{x \in \{0,1\}^n : \ x_j = a_j \ \forall j \in T, \ x_i = 1\},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_p\left(f \Delta 1_S\right) &\le (1-p)\,\mu_i^- + p \mu_p\left(f_{i\to 1} \Delta 1_{S'}\right) \\
&\le (1-p)\left(\frac{C_5(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+)\mu \ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+)\ln(1/p)}\right)}\right) + \frac{C_1 \epsilon_i^+ \ln(1/p) p \mu_i^+}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_i^+ \ln(1/p)}\right)} \\
&\le \frac{\left(C_5\left(\epsilon - \epsilon_i^+\right) + C_1 \epsilon_i^+\right)\mu \ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon \ln(1/p)}\right)} \le \frac{C_1 \epsilon \mu \ln(1/p)}{\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon \ln(1/p)}\right)},
\end{aligned}$$

provided $C_1 \ge C_5$, using Claim 3.10. This completes the inductive step, proving the theorem in the case $\zeta \le p \le 1/2$, and completing the proof of Theorem 1.7.

The inductive proof of Theorem 1.9 is very similar indeed; we omit the details. □

4. Sharpness of Theorems 1.7 and 1.9

Theorem 1.7 is best possible up to the values of the absolute constants c_0 and C_1. This can be seen by taking $f = 1_A$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
A = &\{x \in \{0,1\}^n : \ x_i = 1 \ \forall i \in [t]\} \\
&\cup \{x \in \{0,1\}^n : \ x_i = 1 \ \forall i \in [t+s] \setminus \{t\}, \ x_t = 0\} \\
&\setminus \{x \in \{0,1\}^n : \ x_i = 1 \ \forall i \in [t+s] \setminus \{t+1\}, \ x_{t+1} = 0\},
\end{aligned}$$

for $s,t \in \mathbb{N}$ with $s \geq 2$. Let $0 < p \leq 1/2$. We have $\mu_p(A) = p^t$, and

$$I_i[A] = \begin{cases} p^{t-1} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq t-1; \\ (1-p^{s-1})p^{t-1} & \text{if } i = t; \\ p^{t+s-2} & \text{if } i = t+1; \\ 2(1-p)p^{t+s-2} & \text{if } t+2 \leq i \leq t+s; \\ 0 & \text{if } i > t+s. \end{cases}$$

Hence,

$$I^p[A] = p^{t-1}\left(t + 2(s-1)(1-p)p^{s-1}\right).$$

On the other hand, it is easy to see that

$$\frac{\mu_p(A\Delta S)}{\mu_p(A)} = \frac{\mu_p(A\Delta S)}{p^t} \geq 2(1-p)p^{s-1}$$

for all subcubes S. Hence, if $\epsilon := 2(s-1)(1-p)p^{s-1}$, then

$$pI^p[A] = \mu_p(A)(\log_p(\mu_p(A)) + \epsilon),$$

but

$$\frac{\mu_p(A\Delta S)}{\mu_p(A)} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{s-1} := \delta,$$

for all subcubes S. We have $(s-1)p^{s-1} \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$, so writing $s-1 = x/\ln(1/p)$, we get

$$xe^{-x} \geq \tfrac{1}{2}\epsilon \ln(1/p),$$

which implies

$$x \leq 2\ln\left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right),$$

or equivalently,

$$s-1 \leq \frac{2}{\ln(1/p)}\ln\left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right).$$

Hence,

$$\delta \geq \frac{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}{2\ln\left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)},$$

showing that Theorem 1.7 is best possible up to the value of C_1. Moreover, we clearly require $\epsilon\ln(1/p) < 1$ (i.e., $c_0 < 1$) for the right-hand side of (1.5) to be non-negative.

Observe that the above family A is not monotone increasing. To prove sharpness for Theorem 1.9, we may take $f = 1_B$, where

$$B = \{x \in \{0,1\}^n : \ x_i = 1 \ \forall i \in [t]\} \cup \{x \in \{0,1\}^n : \ x_i = 1 \ \forall i \in [t+s]\setminus\{t\}, \ x_t = 0\}.$$

for $s,t \in \mathbb{N}$ with $s \geq 2$. Let $0 < p < 1$. We have $\mu_p(B) = p^t(1 + (1-p)p^{s-1})$, and

$$I_i^p[B] = \begin{cases} p^{t-1} + (1-p)p^{t+s-2} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq t-1; \\ (1-p^s)p^{t-1} & \text{if } i = t; \\ (1-p)p^{t+s-2} & \text{if } t+1 \leq i \leq t+s; \\ 0 & \text{if } i > t+s. \end{cases}$$

Hence,

$$I^p[B] = p^{t-1}(t + ((t+s)(1-p) - 1)p^{s-1}),$$

and we have

$$\epsilon := \frac{I^p[B] - \mu_p(B)\log_p(\mu_p(B))}{\mu} \leq (s-1)(1-p)p^{s-1}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\frac{\mu_p(B\Delta S)}{\mu_p(B)} = \frac{\mu_p(B\Delta S)}{p^t(1+(1-p)p^{s-1})} \geq \frac{(1-p)p^{t+s-1}}{p^t(1+(1-p)p^{s-1})} \geq \tfrac{1}{2}(1-p)p^{s-1} := \delta$$

for all subcubes S. Similarly to before, we obtain

$$\delta \geq \frac{\epsilon \ln(1/p)}{2\ln\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon\ln(1/p)}\right)},$$

showing that Theorem 1.9 is best possible up to a constant factor depending on η.

We note that B also demonstrates the sharpness of Theorem 1.7, but does not have the nice property of $\log_p(\mu(B)) \in \mathbb{N}$, so we think it worthwhile to include both examples.

5. Isoperimetry via Kruskal-Katona – Proof of Theorem 1.10, and a new proof of the 'full' edge isoperimetric inequality

In this section, we use the Kruskal-Katona theorem and the Margulis-Russo lemma to give a rather short proof of Theorem 1.10, our biased version of the 'full' edge isoperimetric inequality, for monotone increasing sets. We then give the (very short) deduction of Theorem 1.1 (the 'full' edge isoperimetric inequality) from the $p = 1/2$ case of Theorem 1.10, hence providing a new proof of the former — one that relies upon the Kruskal-Katona theorem.

We first give a formal definition of the lexicographic families $\mathcal{L}_\lambda$, for λ not of the form $s/2^n$. For any $\lambda \in (0,1)$, we consider its binary expansion

$$\lambda = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} 2^{i_j},$$

where $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \ldots$, and we let

$$\mathcal{L}_\mu = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \{S \subset \mathbb{N} : \ S \cap [i_j] = [i_j] \setminus \{i_k : \ k < j\}\} \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N}).$$

We identify $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ with the Cantor space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. We let Σ be the σ-algebra on $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ generated by the π-system

$$\left\{\prod_{i=1}^{\infty} A_i : \ A_i \subset \{0,1\} \ \forall i \in \mathbb{N}, \ A_i = \{0,1\} \text{ for all but finitely many } i \in \mathbb{N}\right\}.$$

It is easily checked that $\mathcal{L}_\mu \in \Sigma$.

By the Kolmogorov Extension theorem, there exists a unique probability measure $\mu_p^{(\mathbb{N})}$ on $(\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}, \Sigma)$ such that

$$\mu_p^{(\mathbb{N})}(A_1 \times A_2 \times \ldots \times A_n \times \{0,1\} \times \{0,1\} \times \ldots) = \mu_p^{(n)}(A_1 \times A_2 \times \ldots \times A_n)$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all $A_1, \ldots, A_n \subset \{0,1\}$. Abusing notation slightly, we write $\mu_p = \mu_p^{(\mathbb{N})}$ when the underlying space $\{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is understood.

If $f : \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \{0,1\}$ is Σ-measurable, we (naturally) define

$$I_i^p[f] := \Pr_{x \sim \mu_p}[f(x) \neq f(x \oplus e_i)]$$

and $I^p[f] := \sum_{i=1}^n I_i^p[f]$.

As stated in the Introduction, it is easily checked that

$$\mu_p^{(\mathbb{N})}(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mu_p^{(n)}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\lfloor \lambda 2^n \rfloor / 2^n}\right) \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$I^p[\mathcal{L}_\lambda] = \lim_{n\to\infty} I^p\left[\mathcal{L}_{\lfloor \lambda 2^n \rfloor / 2^n}\right], \tag{5.2}$$

where the families on the left are regarded as subsets of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$, and those on the right are regarded as subsets of $\mathcal{P}([n])$. In fact, (5.1) and (5.2) are the only facts we shall need about the families $\mathcal{L}_\mu$ in order to prove Theorem 1.10.

In our proof of Theorem 1.10, we will use two well-known results. The first is the classical Kruskal-Katona theorem [26, 28]. To state it, we need some more notation. For a family $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ and $0 \leq k \leq n$, we write $\mathcal{F}^{(k)} := \mathcal{F} \cap [n]^{(k)}$. If $k < n$ and $\mathcal{A} \subset [n]^{(k)}$, we write $\partial^+(\mathcal{A}) := \{B \in [n]^{(k+1)} : A \subset B \text{ for some } A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for the upper shadow of $\mathcal{A}$, and if $1 \leq i \leq n-k$, we write $\partial^{+(i)}(\mathcal{A}) := \{B \in [n]^{(k+i)} : A \subset B \text{ for some } A \in \mathcal{A}\}$ for its ith iterate.

Theorem 5.1 (Kruskal-Katona theorem)**.** *Let $k < n$, and let $\mathcal{F} \subset [n]^{(k)}$ with $|\mathcal{F}| = |\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k)}|$. Then $|\partial^+(\mathcal{F})| \geq |\partial^+(\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k)})|$.*

We need the following straightforward corollary.

Corollary 5.2. *Let $n > k_0 > k \geq j \geq 1$ with $n - k_0 \geq j$, suppose that $\mathcal{L}_\lambda \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ depends only upon the coordinates in $[j]$, and let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ be a monotone increasing family with $|\mathcal{F}^{(k_0)}| \leq |\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k_0)}|$. Then $|\mathcal{F}^{(k)}| \leq |\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k)}|$.*

Proof. Suppose that $|\mathcal{F}^{(k_0)}| \leq |\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k_0)}|$, and assume for a contradiction that $|\mathcal{F}^{(k)}| \geq |\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k)}|+1$. Choose λ' minimal such that $|\mathcal{F}^{(k)}| = |\mathcal{L}_{\lambda'}^{(k)}|$; then $\mathcal{L}_{\lambda'}^{(k)} \setminus \mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k)} \neq \emptyset$. Choose $S \in \mathcal{L}_{\lambda'}^{(k)} \setminus \mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k)}$. Since $k_0 \leq n - j$, there exists $S' \supset S$ such that $|S'| = k_0$ and $(S' \setminus S) \cap [j] = \emptyset$, and therefore $S' \in \partial^{+(k_0-k)}(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda'}^{(k)}) \setminus \mathcal{L}_\lambda$. Since $j \leq k_0$, we have $\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k_0)} \subset \partial^{+(k_0-k)}(\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k)}) \subset \partial^{+(k_0-k)}(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda'}^{(k)})$. It follows that $|\partial^{+(k_0-k)}(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda'}^{(k)})| > |\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k_0)}|$. By repeated application of the Kruskal-Katona theorem, since $|\mathcal{F}^{(k)}| = |\mathcal{L}_{\lambda'}^{(k)}|$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is monotone increasing, we have

$$|\mathcal{F}^{(k_0)}| \geq |\partial^{+(k_0-k)}(\mathcal{F}^{(k)})| \geq |\partial^{+(k_0-k)}(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda'}^{(k)})| > |\mathcal{L}_\lambda^{(k_0)}|,$$

a contradiction. □

This implies the following, by a standard application of the method of Dinur-Safra [5] / Frankl-Tokushige [13], known as 'going to infinity and back'. (We present the proof, for completeness.)

Corollary 5.3. *Let $0 < q < p < 1$, let $0 < \lambda < 1$, and let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ be a monotone increasing family with $\mu_p(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mu_p(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)$. Then $\mu_q(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mu_q(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ be a monotone increasing family with $\mu_p(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mu_p(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)$, and suppose for a contradiction that $\mu_q(\mathcal{F}) > \mu_q(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)$. Choose $\lambda' > \lambda$ such that $\mu_q(\mathcal{F}) > \mu_q(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda'})$. By (5.1), there exists $m \geq n$ such that

$$\mu_p^{(m)}(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda'} \cap \mathcal{P}([m])) > \mu_p(\mathcal{L}_\lambda), \quad \mu_q^{(m)}(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda'} \cap \mathcal{P}([m])) > \mu_q(\mathcal{L}_\lambda).$$

Define $\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L}_{\lambda'} \cap \mathcal{P}([m]) \subset \mathcal{P}([m])$; then

$$\mu_p(\mathcal{L}') > \mu_p(\mathcal{L}_\lambda), \quad \mu_q(\mathcal{L}') > \mu_q(\mathcal{L}_\lambda).$$

Now, for any family $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ and $N \geq n$, we define

$$\mathcal{G}_N := \{A \subset [N] : \ A \cap [n] \in \mathcal{G}\}.$$

It is easily checked that for any $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ and any $p \in (0,1)$, we have

$$\mu_p(\mathcal{G}) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{|(\mathcal{G}_N)^{(\lfloor pN \rfloor)}|}{\binom{N}{\lfloor pN \rfloor}}.$$

In particular, we have

$$\mu_q(\mathcal{F}) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{|(\mathcal{F}_N)^{(\lfloor qN \rfloor)}|}{\binom{N}{\lfloor qN \rfloor}}$$

and

$$\mu_q(\mathcal{L}') = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{|(\mathcal{L}'_N)^{(\lfloor qN \rfloor)}|}{\binom{N}{\lfloor qN \rfloor}}.$$

Since $\mu_q(\mathcal{F}) > \mu_q(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda'}) \geq \mu_q(\mathcal{L}')$, for all N sufficiently large (depending on q and m), we have

$$|(\mathcal{F}_N)^{(\lfloor qN \rfloor)}| > |(\mathcal{L}'_N)^{(\lfloor qN \rfloor)}|.$$

Since $\mathcal{L}'_N$ depends only upon the coordinates in $[m]$, and is a lexicographic family, it follows from Corollary 5.2 that if N is sufficiently large depending on p, q and m, then

$$|(\mathcal{F}_N)^{(\lfloor pN \rfloor)}| > |(\mathcal{L}'_N)^{(\lfloor pN \rfloor)}|.$$

Since

$$\mu_p(\mathcal{F}) = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{|(\mathcal{F}_N)^{(\lfloor pN \rfloor)}|}{\binom{N}{\lfloor pN \rfloor}}$$

and

$$\mu_p(\mathcal{L}') = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{|(\mathcal{L}'_N)^{(\lfloor pN \rfloor)}|}{\binom{N}{\lfloor pN \rfloor}},$$

it follows that $\mu_p(\mathcal{F}) \geq \mu_p(\mathcal{L}') > \mu_p(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)$, a contradiction. □

We also need the well-known lemma of Margulis [31] and Russo [32].

Lemma 5.4 (Margulis, Russo)**.** *Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ be a monotone increasing family. Then $\frac{d\mu_p(\mathcal{F})}{dp} = I^p[\mathcal{F}]$.*

The Margulis-Russo lemma implies that $\frac{d}{dp}\mu_p(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) = I^p[\mathcal{L}_\lambda]$ for all λ of the form $\frac{i}{2^j}$. It follows from (5.1) and (5.2) that this formula holds for all $\lambda \in (0,1)$.

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.10.

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family that satisfies the assumptions of the theorem. Note that by Lemma 5.4, for any $p_0 \in (0,1)$, we have $\frac{d}{dp}\mu_p(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)|_{p=p_0} = I^{p_0}[\mathcal{L}_\lambda]$ and $\frac{d}{dp}\mu_p(\mathcal{F})|_{p=p_0} = I^{p_0}[\mathcal{F}]$. By Corollary 5.3, $\mu_q(\mathcal{F}) \leq \mu_q(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)$ for any $q \leq p$. Therefore,

$$I^p[\mathcal{F}] = \lim_{q \to p} \frac{\mu_p(\mathcal{F}) - \mu_q(\mathcal{F})}{p-q} \geq \lim_{q \to p} \frac{\mu_p(\mathcal{L}_\lambda) - \mu_q(\mathcal{L}_\lambda)}{p-q} = I^p[\mathcal{L}_\lambda],$$

as desired. □

The deduction of Theorem 1.1 from Theorem 1.10. This is a standard (and short) 'monotonization' argument. We include it for completeness.

For $i \in [n]$, the *ith monotonization operator* $\mathcal{M}_i : \mathcal{P}([n]) \to \mathcal{P}([n])$ is defined as follows. (See e.g. [23].) If $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$, then for each $S \in \mathcal{F}$ we define

$$\mathcal{M}_i(S) = \begin{cases} S \cup \{i\} & \text{if } S \in \mathcal{F},\ i \notin S \text{ and } S \cup \{i\} \notin \mathcal{F}, \\ S & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and we define $\mathcal{M}_i(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mathcal{M}_i(S) : S \in \mathcal{F}\}$. It is well-known, and easy to check, that for any $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$, we have $|\mathcal{M}_i(\mathcal{F})| = |\mathcal{F}|$ and

$$I_j^{1/2}[\mathcal{M}_i(\mathcal{F})] \leq I_j^{1/2}[\mathcal{F}] \quad \forall j \in [n];$$

summing over all j we obtain

$$I^{1/2}[\mathcal{M}_i(\mathcal{F})] \leq I^{1/2}[\mathcal{F}].$$

Observe that the $\mathcal{M}_i$'s transform a family to a monotone increasing one, in the sense that for any $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$, the family $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{M}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{F})$ is monotone increasing; note also that $|\mathcal{G}| = |\mathcal{F}|$ and $I^{1/2}[\mathcal{G}] \leq I^{1/2}[\mathcal{F}]$.

Now let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$, and let $\mathcal{L}_\lambda \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ be a lexicographic family with $|\mathcal{L}_\lambda| = |\mathcal{F}|$. Let $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{M}_1 \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{M}_n(\mathcal{F})$; then $|\mathcal{G}| = |\mathcal{F}|$, $I^{1/2}[\mathcal{G}] \leq I^{1/2}[\mathcal{F}]$, and $\mathcal{G}$ is monotone increasing. By Theorem 1.10, we have $I^{1/2}[\mathcal{G}] \geq I^{1/2}[\mathcal{L}_\lambda]$, and therefore $I^{1/2}[\mathcal{F}] \geq I^{1/2}[\mathcal{G}] \geq I^{1/2}[\mathcal{L}_\lambda]$, proving Theorem 1.1.

6. Open Problems

A natural open problem is to obtain a p-biased edge-isoperimetric inequality for arbitrary (i.e., not necessarily monotone increasing) families, which is sharp for all values of the p-biased measure. This is likely to be difficult, as there is no nested sequence of extremal families. Indeed, it is easily checked that if $p < 1/2$, the unique families $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ with $\mu_p(\mathcal{F}) = p$ and minimal $I_p[\mathcal{F}]$ are the dictatorships, whereas the unique families $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{P}([n])$ with $\mu_p(\mathcal{G}) = 1-p$ and minimal $I_p[\mathcal{G}]$ are the antidictatorships; clearly, none of the former are contained in any of the latter.

Another natural problem is to obtain a sharp stability version of our 'full' biased edge isoperimetric inequality for monotone increasing families (i.e., Theorem 1.10). This would generalise (the monotone case of) Theorem 1.4, our sharp stability version of the 'full' edge isoperimetric inequality. It seems likely that the proof in [9] can be extended to the biased case using the methods of the current paper, but the resulting proof is expected to be rather long and complex.

Finally, it is highly likely that the values of the absolute constants in Theorem 1.7, and of the constants depending upon η in Theorem 1.9, could be substantially improved. Note for example that Theorem 1.7 applies only to Boolean functions whose total influence is very close to the minimum possible, namely, for $pI^p[f] \leq$

$\mu_p[f]\left(\log_p(\mu_p[f])+\epsilon\right)$, where $\epsilon \le c_0/\ln(1/p)$ and c_0 is very small. It is likely that the conclusion holds under the weaker assumption $\epsilon < 1/\ln(1/p)$. Such an extension is not known even for the uniform measure. (See, for example, the conjectures in [6].)

References

[1] R. Ahlswede and L. H. Khachatrian, The complete intersection theorem for systems of finite sets, *Europ. J. Combin.* **18** (1997), pp. 125–136.

[2] I. Benjamini, G. Kalai and O. Schramm, Noise sensitivity of Boolean functions and applications to percolation, *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.* **90** (1999), pp. 5–43.

[3] A. J. Bernstein, Maximally connected arrays on the n-cube, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **15** (1967), pp. 1485-1489.

[4] J. Bourgain, An appendix to [16].

[5] I. Dinur and S. Safra, On the hardness of approximating minimum vertex-cover, *Ann. Math.* **162** (2005), pp. 439–485.

[6] D.Ellis, Almost isoperimetric subsets of the discrete cube, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **20** (2011), pp. 363-380.

[7] D. Ellis, Y. Filmus and E. Friedgut, Triangle-intersecting families of graphs, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **14** (2012), pp. 841–885.

[8] D. Ellis, N. Keller and N. Lifshitz, Stability versions of Erdős-Ko-Rado type theorems, via isoperimetry, preprint, arXiv:1604.02160, 2016

[9] D. Ellis, N. Keller, and N. Lifshitz, On the structure of subsets of the discrete cube with small edge boundary, preprint, arXiv:1612.06680, 2016.

[10] D. Ellis and N. Lifshitz, On the union of intersecting families, preprint, arXiv:1610.03027, 2016.

[11] P. Erdős, C. Ko and R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Quart. J. Math., Oxford, Second Series* **12** (1961), pp. 313–320.

[12] P. Frankl, Improved bounds for Erdős' Matching Conjecture, *J. Combin. Theory, Series A* **120** (2013) pp. 1068–1072.

[13] P. Frankl and N. Tokushige, Weighted multiply intersecting families, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* **40** (2003), pp. 287–291.

[14] P. Frankl and Z. Füredi, Extremal Problems concerning Kneser Graphs, *J. Combin. Theory, Series B* **40** (1986), pp. 270–285.

[15] E. Friedgut, Boolean functions with low average sensitivity depend on few coordinates, *Combinatorica* **18** (1998), pp. 27–35.

[16] E. Friedgut, Sharp thresholds of graph proprties, and the k-sat Problem, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **12** (1999), pp. 1017–1054.

[17] E. Friedgut and G. Kalai, Every monotone graph property has a sharp threshold, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **124** (1996), pp. 2993–3002.

[18] E. Friedgut, G. Kalai and A. Naor, Functions whose Fourier Transform is Concentrated on the First Two Levels, *Adv. Appl. Math.* **29** (2002), 427–437.

[19] L. H. Harper, Optimal assignments of numbers to vertices, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **12** (1964), pp. 131-135.

[20] S. Hart, A note on the edges of the n-cube, *Discrete Math.* **14** (1976), pp. 157-163.

[21] H. Hatami, A structure theorem for Boolean functions with small total influences, *Ann. Math.*, **176** (2012), pp. 509–533.

[22] J. Kahn and G. Kalai, Thresholds and expectation thresholds, *Combin. Probab. Comput.* **16** (2007), pp. 495–502.

[23] J. Kahn, G. Kalai and N. Linial. The influence of variables on Boolean functions. *Proceedings of the 29th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pp. 68–80, 1988.

[24] G. Kalai, Boolean functions: Influence, thresholds, and noise, Proceedings of the 7th European Congress of Mathematics, 2016, to appear. Preprint available at `https://gilkalai.files.wordpress.com/2017/01/7ecmkalr.pdf`.

[25] G. Kalai and M. Safra, Threshold phenomena and influence, in: *Computational Complexity and Statistical Physics* (A.G. Percus, G. Istrate and C. Moore, eds.), Oxford University Press, New York, 2006, pp. 25–60.

[26] G. O. H. Katona, A theorem of finite sets, in: 'Theory of Graphs', *Proc. Colloq. Tihany*, Hungary, 1966, pp. 187–207.
[27] P. Keevash, Shadows and intersections: stability and new proofs, *Adv. Math.* **218** (2008), pp. 1685–1703.
[28] J. B. Kruskal, The number of simplices in a complex, in *Mathematical Optimization Techniques*, Univ. California Press, Berkeley, 1963, pp. 251–278.
[29] I. Leader, Personal communication, 2009.
[30] J. H. Lindsey II, Assignment of numbers to vertices, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **71** (1964) pp. 508–516.
[31] G. A. Margulis, Probabilistic characteristics of graphs with large connectivity, *Prob. Peredachi Inform.* **10** (1974), pp. 101–108.
[32] L. Russo, An approximate zero-one law, *Z. Wahrsch. Verw. Gebiete* **61** (1982), pp. 129–139.
[33] A. Samorodnitsky, An inequality for functions on the Hamming cube, to appear in *Combinatorics, Probability and Computing*. arXiv:1207.1233. (Preprint available from 2009.)
[34] M. Talagrand, On Russo's approximate 0-1 law, *Ann. Probab.* **22** (1994) pp. 1576-1587.

David Ellis, School of Mathematical Sciences, Queen Mary, University of London, Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, UK.
E-mail address: d.ellis@qmul.ac.uk

Nathan Keller, Department of Mathematics, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan 5290002, Israel.
E-mail address: nathan.keller27@gmail.com

Noam Lifshitz, Department of Mathematics, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan 5290002, Israel.
E-mail address: noamlifshitz@gmail.com